Brahmin Clans
Author(s): D. D. Kosambi
Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 73, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1953), pp. 202-208
Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/594855
Accessed: 04-11-2015 00:29 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 128.252.67.66 on Wed, 04 Nov 2015 00:29:09 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

would have been elated to see this distinguished career of the ancient Indian drama which he had introduced to the West in 1789. Yet he had expressed the desire for an even grander result in his Preface to the *Sakuntala*: "It is my anxious wish that others may take the pains to learn Sanscrit, and may be persuaded to translate the works of Cálidás." The grander result has also taken place, with Kalidasa's complete works now available in most of the major languages of the world.

The *Sakuntala*, then, had come a long way since Jones's mention of it in diary letters of September 4-6, 1787. Even while the luster of his reputation dimmed across two centuries, the *Sakuntala* strengthened its hold as one of the masterpieces of world literature, and the reputation of Kalidasa as a universal poet and dramatist rose with it.

Englishmen regard Shakespeare as the greatest poet the world has ever produced; Indians likewise pay the same compliment to Kalidasa. The fact is that both Shakespeare and Kalidasa are world-poets. Although they belong to different times and nationalities, they are for all time and universal. It is however well worth remembering that the Bard of Ujjain lived eleven hundred years before the birth of the Bard of Avon.[6]

It is, therefore, only appropriate that one of the great modern leaders of India, Nehru, should write of Jones's contribution to world literature and India:

It was through his writings and translations that Europe first had a glimpse of some of the treasures of Sanskrit literature. . . . To Jones and to many other European scholars India owes a deep debt of gratitude for the rediscovery of her past literature.[7]

[6] R. Padman, "Shakespeare and Kalidasa," *Indian Review*, XLVII (Sept., 1946), 477.

[7] Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (New York, 1946), p. 317.

BRAHMIN CLANS*

D. D. KOSAMBI

TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH

THE BRAHMINS in India still preserve a system of exogamous groups, called *gotra* and *pravara*, within the endogamous caste; these groups have the same names, derived supposedly from immemorial antiquity, cutting across the many regional, linguistic and other Brahmin subcastes forming smaller endogamous groups for which no sanction exists besides custom. Hence the translation of *gotra* by 'clan' is justified only by lack of a better one. The earliest works on ritual like Baudhāyana contain only a skeleton list of the pravaras, the pravara being a group of gotras forming the ultimate exogamous unit. Brough supplies a long-felt need by working meticulously over the translation of a gotra list and rules given by Puruṣottama, an author of unknown date (not later than 1450 A.D.) who collected and arranged older literature. The translation was made very difficult by the lack of a reliable text. The uncritical work of P. Chentsal Rao (Mysore, 1900, out of print) gives several divergent lists. Brough has worked through his manuscript evidence with care, selecting readings with insight, presenting the variants, tracing quotations with admirable patience and great success. This will earn him the gratitude of every worker in the field. One of his most valuable conclusions is that the rolls as they now exist derive from one prototype, which may be regarded as the Matsya Purāṇa.

Brough's general opinions, as set forth in his preface, are supported neither by the evidence he has translated, nor by any other known to exist. Inasmuch as the substantial merits of the book proper make them all the more misleading, the bulk of this article has, unfortunately, to be devoted to criticizing the few pages of the preface, rather than to well-deserved praise of the rest.

1. The first part of the title is not justified.

* *The early brahmanical system of gotra and pravara. A translation of the Gotra-pravara-mañjarī of Puruṣottama-paṇḍita.* With an introduction by John Brough. Pp. x + 215. (Cambridge: University Press, 1953.)

This content downloaded from 128.252.67.66 on Wed, 04 Nov 2015 00:29:09 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The gotra list cannot possibly be early, no matter how archaic the system. The oldest authority, as noted, is the Matsya Purāṇa. The purāṇas were being revised till the early Gupta period, as has been proved by Pargiter's[1] analysis of the historical "prophetic" portion. Their great prototype, the Mahābhārata, has been rewritten[2] not earlier than the second century A. D., no matter how much of the older versions survived. That the system is itself not much older IN ITS PRESENT FORM than the purāṇas is made clear by the artificial grouping into 18 separate major groups, in spite of the insistence that the original ancestors were the seven sages. There exist at least two separate lists of these seven sages, while seven (with Agastya as eighth) cannot account even for the principal groups. Now the number 18 has a special sanctity in the purāṇa-Mbh complex. There are 18 major purāṇas; the Mbh is the story in 18 sections (regrouped from 100) of a battle fought over 18 days, by 18 divisions that annihilated each other. The influence remains paramount till the days of the poet Rājaśekhara (about 920 A. D.) who composes his Kavirahasya in the puranic manner to justify the profession of making verses. That the 18 major gotra groups are not original is to be seen from the dissociation of the Kāṇvas from the Kāśyapas, though both are closely allied according to the Śakuntalā episode, while being jointly excluded from sacrificial gifts by an injunction of Hiraṇyakeśin-Satyāṣāḍha (to whom at least one of the untraced quotations on p. 198 is due). While stating (p. 27) that this last authority completely omits six of the eighteen groups, Brough PRESUMES the loss to be recent, without material evidence of any such loss.

2. Brough's methodology is open to far more serious objections. He cites with approval Benveniste's derivation of *ari* as the designation of the other moiety, at once friendly and hostile, of a society with dual organisation. To him, "it explains satisfactorily the ambivalence of the term, since the *ari* would come as a friend to the marriage ceremony." To derive Aryan exogamy from this frail support in philology means ignoring other ambivalent words, such as ξένος in Greek and *hostis* in Latin with the same meaning. The occurrence is so common that Karl Abel suggested a theory, popularized by Freud, that such words arise with diametrically opposite meaning when they first appear in language. The philological method needs a historical vacuum in which to shed any light, like the carbon filament of an electric light. Otherwise, we get extraordinary results, that Indo-Europeans had feet but no hands; or like those of Sommer, who philologized the Achaeans right off the map, applying rigid phonetic rules to Forrer's Hittite-Greek equations. There, as in the present case, we have to pay attention to the presence of non-Indo-Europeans in long, close contact with the people concerned. Certainly, unlike vedic kinship terminology, the word *gotra* ('cowpen') is not Iranian, let alone Greek or Latin; yet the institution certainly existed in the the earliest Roman gentes (with many unmistakably totemic names like Porcia, Fabia, Ovidia, Asinia, etc.), and in pre-Kleisthenes Athens. Moreover, exogamous clan-groups are known at a primitive stage in almost every type of society, including the highly civilized Chinese, Australian aborigines, African and American tribesmen. Thus we have to compare not mere words but forms of the INSTITUTION with full reference to the social context. It is to be hoped that, when extending the present investigations, Brough will pay some attention to books like R. Briffault's *The Mothers*; or, if he prefers disjointed accumulation of facts, E. Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage*.

3. Like any other living institution, the gotra system changed. One looks in vain through Brough's work for any consciousness of this, or working out of the implications. For example, the position of the Jātūkarṇyas is uncertain in the various traditions (p. 180), but this seems to the translator the fault of some text, not uncertainty of the synthesis. He does note, in examining a "relatively small" number of inscriptions, discordances "some of which must betray fictitious Brahmans" (p. xvii). It does not suffice to discard a few seemingly aberrant gotra names as of "fictitious" Brahmins, without inquiry whether all Brahmins were not relatively fictitious at some

[1] See the introduction to F. E. Pargiter's *The Purāṇa text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* (Oxford, 1913).

[2] In fact, the reliably edited (by Sukṭhankar) portions of the Poona *BORI* critical Mahābhārata prove that the process of revision continued till modern times. Sukṭhankar's successors seem to favour continuation of such revision, if one takes literally their published ideas (without a shred of evidence) as to how the Mbh came to be written and inflated.

This content downloaded from 128.252.67.66 on Wed, 04 Nov 2015 00:29:09 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

stage or other as in some "black Iyengar" villages of Karṇāṭaka. Certainly, the Latin *flamen*, no matter how satisfactory to the philologists, is not the equivalent of the Brahmin in India, even at the earliest vedic age. How did the institution develop? As for particular Brahmin groups, it is seen at once, by reference to the actual citations in the Ṛgveda, and by the later attributions of Ṛgvedic hymns to authors, that the Kaśyapas are certainly not of any importance at the early stage, if indeed they were Brahmins at first. Yet they become very prominent at the later vedic period, with Asita (in Pāli tradition, Kāla) Devala, whom tradition places as just before the time of the Buddha. How is it that their claim to great antiquity is allowed by other Brahmin gotras, even though the exclusion from sacrificial gifts, i. e. the active priesthood, survives in at least one book, as mentioned above? The explanation which I have ventured to give is that PART of the institution is formed under the influence of pre-Aryan culture. Pargiter (*Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*), basing himself rather narrowly on the very same purāṇas to which Brough traces the oldest complete gotra lists, concluded that the Brahmins far antedate Aryans. Some such conclusion is forced upon us by the puranic statement that Rākṣasas were among the (clearly un-Aryan) descendants of Agastya, not to speak of Pulastya.

In considering the historicity of clan names, one is puzzled by the disappearance of the Śyāparṇa Brahmins (Ait. Brāh. 7. 27) whose sacrificial rights were saved by Rāma Mārgaveya. Neither Śyāparṇa nor Mārgaveya is in the lists, while Mārgava is a low, mixed, fisherman caste in the Manusmṛti 10. 34, a tribal name absorbed into the later caste system. Śyāparṇa Sāyakāyana was the last (Śat. Brāh. 4. 2. 1. 39) to perform the complete fivefold sacrifice, which includes human sacrifice; is he, alone among Śyāparṇas, represented by Sāyakāyaniḥ of the Gārgyas? The Vikarṇa of Pāṇini 4. 1. 117 accounts for the Vaikarṇas among Vatsas; 4. 1. 124 for the Kāśyapa Vaikarṇeyas. It would be extraordinary if these were unconnected with the DUAL Ṛgvedic (vii. 18. 11) tribe *Vaikarṇayoḥ janān* struck down in battle by king Sudās, along with another tribe Bhṛgu whose total Brahminization is undeniable. Similarly Vālaśikhas among the Vāsiṣṭhas can only be connected to the Varaśikhas (RV vi. 27. 4-5) wiped out at Harappā by Indra. Thus gotras could become extinct, new ones enrolled from non-Aryan or non-Brahminized families and tribes; the conscription need not even be in the same clan-group. Therefore a unitary, definitive gotra list for all time is far too much to expect.

4. In the preface, Brough has criticized some views of mine;[3] as the points vitally concern the subject of early gotras, it is necessary to consider a few of them even at the risk of giving the discussion a controversial flavor. For the rest, let me state once again that I have never believed in an Aryan RACE, having gathered a considerable amount of evidence for the progressive "Aryanization" of people whose beliefs were penetrated by Brahmin ritual, with reciprocal influence upon Brahminism.

On p. xvi of the preface, Brough says that my views about the descendants of Tvāṣṭra are void through uncertainty, for the two names Tittiri and Kapiñjala "may well be of late origin." The whole point of the Tvāṣṭra story is that it occurs in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā, which would not repeat such a myth about the name Tittiri without a measure of belief. The Saṃhitā is far older than any of the documents from which Brough reproduces his gotra lists. Similarly for totemism, where I casually gave a few of the better-known names as evidence of totemic ORIGIN, survivals from a far older stage; there is no implication that the developed Brahmin society was totemic in the same sense as the Australians studied by Spencer and Gillen. Roman society did not favor human sacrifice, but survivals such as the formula *sacer esto* for capital punishment, the *pisciculi pro animis humanis* furnished at the June 7 fish-fry for Vulcanus, and many other references show that the sacrifice had once really existed. Says Brough, "the essential feature of totemism which we should look for is definite identification of an individual with his totem." It seems to me that there survives enough in the way of observances and superstition to show that this too had once prevailed. At the time of birth, the Hindu child is still assigned to one animal yoni (out of 14), though the animal cannot obviously be associated with the constellation of birth. I further suggest that the particular animal given to each Hindu

[3] He refers to nothing later than my "Origin of Brahmin Gotras," *J. Bom. Branch Roy. As. Soc.*, 26 (1950), 21-80; some of the ideas briefly expressed there have been developed in greater detail, *JBBRAS* 27 (1951), 1-30; *ibid.* 180-213.

This content downloaded from 128.252.67.66 on Wed, 04 Nov 2015 00:29:09 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

god as a vehicle must have been totemic in origin, the custom going far back to the Indus valley and paralleled in Mesopotamia, as proved by cylinder and stamp seals, not to speak of Hittite sculptures or Egyptian theriomorphic gods. During the millennia of urban, literate, but pre-Aryan culture which have left their mark upon Hinduism, there were great developments away from the crude idea of a totem, yet it was never lost simply because there always co-existed (as they still do) primitive cultures with whom the society remained in contact. The caste system managed to absorb them sooner or later, not without concessions on both sides.

Perhaps the best evidence for derivation from a once stronger totemism is the word *vrata*, which now generally means 'observance,' but initially meant 'behavior like' a particular creature and is carefully illustrated in the Majjhimanikāya 57 = *kukkura-vatika-suttanta*, (and Dīghanīkāya *24*) where we have the ascetic Acela Seṇiya following the dog-vrata. The Buddha says that after death this fanatic will naturally be reborn as a dog; this disturbs his Koliyan lay follower, who is himself a bull-vrata man, hence could expect transmigration into bull form. The idea of transmigration is natural to believers in totemism first because of the identification of the individual with his totem; then because several totems form a society. As for the other (sometimes contested) aspect of totemism, namely that the totem animal or plant was formerly the main diet later become tabu, we have the tabu against beef-eating and names like Pippalāda. The word *vrata* also had the meaning 'feeding exclusively upon,' proved by *madhu-vrata* for a bee. The *govratins* are not a Buddhist fiction but mentioned with approbation in the Mahābhārata 5. 97. 13-14, where a special section of the nether world is assigned to them, among minor demons as in Dīghanikāya 24; a stanza was especially written into the text to explain that the *go-vrata* observers were those who imitated the spiritual placidity of the bull; identification of the individual with the totem animal is not in doubt!

A historic clan-name like Śātakarṇī could hardly have come into existence without harking back to totemism. Their inscriptions give only its Prakrit form *Sātakaṇi*. However, Brough notices "a Prakritic tendency" (p. xii) in his text and it is clear from Pargiter's work that the purāṇas have been Sanskritized from an account which was originally in some Prakrit, probably in Pāli. The *sāta* is presumably the Sanskrit *sapti*; not meaning 'seven,' but (as seen from Ṛgvedic usage) 'horse,' with special reference to the horses of the sun. Thus the proper Sanskrit form is *Saptivāhana* (as the Kalki Purāṇa reports it) rather than *Śātavāhana* which is the faulty re-Sanskritization; *Saptikarṇa*, 'horse-ear' is a split-totem.

Brough points out an "egregious error" into which scholars are not likely to fall, namely taking *Gotama* as the Buddha's baptismal name instead of a *gotra*-name. I have fallen into it nevertheless, in excellent company,[4] which includes the whole of the early Buddhistic order, and Buddha's own family as well. At least, his stepmother Mahāprajāpatī Gotamī says in the verses ascribed to her in the Therī-gāthā, *bahūnaṃ vata atthāya Māyā janayi Gotamam*: 'verily for the benefit of many did Māyā give birth to Gotama,' which makes Gotama no more of a clan-name than Māyā; Siddhārtha is a later name, absent in the older Pāli canon. Moreover, as this Gotamī is his maternal aunt and stepmother, it is not the Buddha's gotra. Brough explains this away by saying "Mahāprajāpatī took the name Gautamī virtually as a surname, on the occasion of her marriage into the clan." Why she alone of all the women of her time needed a virtual surname does not appear. Buddha's wife (Vaśodharā in the Apadāna, Gopā in the Lalitavistara), is called Bhaddā Kaccānā (not Gotamī) in the same sources, i. e. Kātyāyanī, which can only be her maiden gotra. Moreover, no other member of the Buddha's family seems to have been addressed as Gotama. When the Buddhist monk is initiated, he becomes a 'son of the Sakyans,' not a Gotamid; the Gotamaka almsmen were a later, small group. Finally, the Buddha is called Āṅgirasa, but this means 'sun' in Pāli, just as it means 'light-god' so often in the Ṛgveda (iv. 2. 15; v. 45. 8—cf. ἄγγελος), not in the sense of a clan-group. Brough dismisses the ancient Sutta-Nipāta words ascribed to the Buddha: *ādiccā nāma gottena, Sākiyā nāma jātiyā*, '[I am]

[4] This group also includes at least one scholar of unchallenged command over both the gotra system (into which he was born) and the Pāli canon: my father, the late Prof. Dharmānanda Kosambī, from whom I first learned of both. The discussion as to the Buddha's gotra is taken from his Marāṭhī writings, particularly *Bhagavān Buddha*, 2 vols. (Nagpur, 1940, 1941).

This content downloaded from 128.252.67.66 on Wed, 04 Nov 2015 00:29:09 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of the *āditya* gotra, Sākiyan family,' saying that *āditya* merely signifies descent in the solar line. Certainly, all Sakyans claimed Ikṣvāku (etymologically related to *ikṣu* 'sugarcane or gourd,' which has a totemic appearance) as their ancestor; hence perhaps the later puranic fiction of a solar lineage, but if so, they must all have been *ādiccā nāma gottena*. Possible but improbable conclusions are then that the Pāli word *gotta* does not mean the Sanskrit *gotra* here though it does elsewhere; or inasmuch as the Sakyans were too proud to mate with non-Sakyans, the *gotta* is not an exogamous unit, hence irrelevant to the entire discussion. The first interpretation of Gotama as Buddha's gotra name is in the Mahāpadānasutta of the Dīghanikāya, obviously a late formation under Brahmin influence; one could even say, influence of Kaśyapa Brahmins, as is the Jain Mahāvīra's supposed gotra and birth story.

5. What is needed to round out any theoretical work on the gotra, — all Brahmin texts specialize in theory to the detriment of fact — is field work, plus search in the inscriptions. Brough tried the latter without discarding his tacit hypothesis that the gotra list exists as a closed record which may be restored merely by inspection of a correct manuscript. This, I fear, is not true; the one reproach that can be levelled against his editorial work is that the manuscript evidence gathered does not suffice to deal with Brahmin gotras as a system. The decennial *Census* of India carefully avoided recording any of the gotras actually claimed by the various Brahmins, though it showed (under the British) a remarkable predilection for emphasizing religious and communal differences among Indians. I suggest that if manuscripts were collected from all parts of the country, the gotra lists would show a far greater variation than Brough imagines, or Chentsal Rao has printed. This variation must be taken seriously; the lists were not meant to prevent "scholars" from falling into egregious error, but for the daily use of priests who performed the rites. Thus, there is a case within my own knowledge where the boy was assigned to the Devataras gotra at his initiation simply because the officiating purohita's list did not contain the ancient Devarāta gotra; the priest insisted that no such gotra existed, and the family yielded to his superior knowledge!

The Karhāḍā Brahmins of Mahārāṣṭra have only 24 gotras, the Citpāvans 14, the Sārasvats 21; but actual family surveys by Śeṭe and others have shown that among the Deśasthas, the Yajurvedī group has a far greater number, well over a hundred. Only this type of investigation without puranic theological prejudices can show what survives of the ancient clan-system. The field work must be undertaken fairly soon, for the system is falling into desuetude, the gotra names into oblivion.

The essential fact is that no system can long outlive (even in form) the productive structure of society upon which it is based. The people of India no longer make their living as their ancestors did two thousand years ago; the machine age makes a sudden, profound difference. Differences of religion and language were aggravated by political circumstances, but nothing of the sort is likely to lead to a survival, reform, or extension of the gotra system. The sole public reaction to recent legislation permitting marriages within the gotra was total apathy. After all, most of the population have no gotra at all; of those that have, the younger generation rarely know their own gotra name; in practice the prohibition of *sagotra* marriages was usually circumvented by a fictitious adoption. Yet the system at one time succeeded in imposing itself over some foreign sections of the population: the Bhils call their septs *got*. Among the Vaiśyas[5] of the south we have list of a thousand gotras (another of 25 pravaras) produced from otherwise unknown ṛṣi ancestors, obvi-

[5] This refers particularly to the Vaiśya community in Mysore. The information comes from several sources, the most important of which is a Telugu ms containing the *gotra* list; this was acquired by Brahmasri V. S. Rāmacandra Śāstrigaḷ (from the survivors of a Brahmin *purohita* who ministered to Vaiśya families) and transcribed for my use. Afterwards, Mr. A. R. Vāsudeva Mūrthy of Bangalore found some locally published lists in Kanarese and Telugu containing much the same names. Detailed field work is still wanting, but contemplated. In this connection, the reader may be referred to a Hindi work *Jaina-Saṃpradāya-Śikṣā* (*Bombay NSP*, 1931) by the Śvetāmbara Jaina *yati* śrī-Śrīpālajī; the fifth section shows the traditional development of an exogamous system in Rājasthān, both after conversion to Jainism, in which case the founder began his own clan, and on an older clan-locality basis within the bigger groups of the Oswāls, Khandelwāls etc. As the people concerned were traders and fighters both, supposedly descendants of Scythian invaders, the direct influence of Brahminism here may be less than convenience of the system for that stage of social development.

This content downloaded from 128.252.67.66 on Wed, 04 Nov 2015 00:29:09 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

ously under Brahmin influence as is the list of 102 Komaṭī gotras. This is flatly contrary to the solitary Vaiśya pravara given in all the Brahmin books, as also to the alternative rule that the Brahmin purohita's gotra is to be taken as that of the Vaiśya pravara given in all the Brahmin books, as also to the alternative rule that the Brahmin purohita's gotra is to be taken as that of the Vaiśya family for which he officiates. Less than a third of the Mysore Vaiśya families seem to observe this rule; the rest have their own gotras, of which the greater number seem to have gone originally in the female line, for the son is often assigned to his maternal uncle's gotra. This illustrates the readjustments Brahminism was able to make when circumstances demanded it, without giving up its theoretical immutability.

The purāṇas themselves state that the "real" kṣatriyas died out before the Mauryans. It is fairly clear that the older Brahminism did too. What remained afterwards was a constantly changing class that claimed ancient sanction by preserving as far as possible the old FORMS, which became progressively hollower, particularly after Islam. It is to this late period that Brough's text belongs. The really interesting as well as important study would be to weigh it against reality, to see how far the content of the system had developed away from its supposed archaic substance under the pressure of history.

6. The essential feature of the gotra system, ignored by Brough, is its relation to property. Here, the philological, literary, and ritual sūtra evidence all agree, while the historical development becomes clear. The etymology of gotra as 'a herd of cattle' in early vedic times shows that the name was naturally transferred to the group of human beings associated with the herd as a unit—the common owners of the herd. Pāṇini 4. 3. 127 (with the Kāśikā) shows that each *saṃgha* (tribe) and gotra had once its own cattle-brand *aṅka*, which is possible if and only if at one time the cattle were the indistinguishable common property of the tribe or gotra. That tribal names agree also with gotra names, so that tribes could develop into, or give rise to, gotras is seen from the gaṇapātha. Śālaṅkāyana is a tribal name as well as a Viśvāmitra gotra. Coins of the Udumbara-Audumbara tribe have been dug up in profusion; the name is totemic, the tree being actually shown on the coins; yet we have the gotra in all Viśvāmitra lists. With further differentiation in property rights, the gotra naturally develops into the large patriarchal joint family, still holding its property in common. The name would not change, for cattle are the main form of property at the earlier stage, continuing as the principal expression and natural measure (cf. Latin *pecunia*) of wealth even later, when property in land becomes admissible.

The same relations are clearly reflected in the sūtras, but with a further break-up of the family. Yājñavalkya 2. 135 gives the gentiles, *gotraja*, as heirs in default of immediate relatives, as in Rome. Manusmṛti 9. 182-3 says that one son for several brothers or for several co-wives shall count as the son of all. These rules clearly indicate former group-marriage and group-property; even better proof is the *kṣetraja* heir, begotten by a *sagotra* (gentilis) upon the widow of a man who dies without a son, for inheritance of the property (Ms. 9. 190). The right of doing this belongs preferentially to the brother of the deceased (Ms. 9. 146), but if he exercise it without formal appointment, or with desire, or when a legitimate son already exists, it amounts to adultery (Ms. 9. 59-62; 9. 143-147). Apastamba 2. 27. 2-7 (82. 13. 7) is still more explicit, admitting that the bride was given to the whole family rather than to a single husband in older times, but that this practice is now forbidden. Correspondingly, the Manusmṛti contradicts its own theory of the legitimate kṣetraja pseudo-son (Ms. 9. 32-55, 173) by saying against all usage and common sense that the fruit belongs to the owner of the seed, not of the field (wife). This is really on account of the developed forms of property, as is seen from Ms. 9. 104-5 which gives two alternatives: either all property is to be divided equally among the sons, or the eldest inherits all with the duty of supporting his brothers, in place of the father. Both show equal rights of all in the joint property of the patriarchal household, which divides in the first case, remains undivided in the second. The Manusmṛti, like most similar works, labors under the strain of reconciling the old and the new. It may be noted that the word for such heritable property is *riktha*, that which may be alienated as having been acquired by the individual's labor (Ms. 9. 208-9), hence not common property—which seems to have existed simultaneously. In any case, cattle are no longer the principal form of wealth, so that

This content downloaded from 128.252.67.66 on Wed, 04 Nov 2015 00:29:09 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the gotra has its traditional force greatly weakened in practice.

To follow this a little further: Woman, according to these smṛtis, is herself a peculiar form of property through which a son could be obtained for continuity of the remaining property, and for offering food to the manes. This develops with progressive specialization of individual property rights of the male, to culminate in the ban upon brahmin widow remarriage. The implication for the earlier stage is that the gotra had a common cult of the dead, providing for them beyond the grave just as it provided for the aged members of the gotra who were no longer able to feed themselves in this world. Where the rights of the woman's clan were strongly maintained—as must originally have been the case before patriarchy prevailed—we have the development of the Āsura marriage (Ms. 3. 31) by bride-purchase; if the woman so married die without issue, her property reverts to her parents (Ms. 9. 197) which implies that some gotras once derived from the mother, not the father. Finally, there was the case of sons by wives of a different caste, who therefore had no gotra; their inheritance is limited to a gift from the father during his lifetime, from his own personal wealth, particularly if legitimate heirs existed. It follows that such a son would have to work as a servant, or to learn some craft. I suggest that this last explains the otherwise uncalled-for presentation in our smṛtis of professional guilds as mixed castes.

This content downloaded from 128.252.67.66 on Wed, 04 Nov 2015 00:29:09 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions